

submitted arguments addressing the claims that depend from claim 46 on page 10 of his brief. Exhibit C.

Claim 53 is also independent. As noted above, arguments were submitted by the applicant that applied jointly to claims 46 and 53 in so far as the applicant contended that the references cited by the examiner against both claims were improperly combined. However, the applicant separately argued claim 53's patentability in view of the combination on page 10 of his brief. Exhibit C. Therefore, the applicant's brief contains separate arguments with respect to each claim group designated by the applicant.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and comments, the applicant's brief of November 27, 2002, is believed to be in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c), and the examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw his notice of Non-Compliance. If the examiner believes there is any further matter which may be resolved via teleconference he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:



William David Kiesel

Registration No. 25,883

ROY, KIESEL, KEEGAN & DENICOLA

2355 Drusilla Lane

P.O. Box 15928

Baton Rouge, LA 70895

(225) 927-9908

Dated: January 30, 2003